



STATE OF MISSOURI
MISSOURI DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT PROGRAM
SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT ANNUAL REPORT

1. SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DISTRICT

Northwest Missouri Regional Solid Waste Management
District - Region A

2. FISCAL YEAR PERIOD:

FROM JULY 1, 2008 TO JUNE 30, 2009

GOALS AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

3 (a). What waste goals did the district have for the fiscal year period and what actions did the district take to achieve these goals?

The Northwest Missouri Regional Solid Waste Management District's primary goal is to reduce the amount of waste entering the local waste stream. Due to lacking infrastructure in northwest Missouri, the District believes educating the public is top priority in reducing the amount of waste being created. This goal was stressed in the District's updated solid waste plan that was reviewed the past fiscal year. The District also focused on educating the region through public outreach events the District sponsored. The District conducted a reusable grocery bag program at county fairs and held two composting workshops in Nodaway and Atchison counties to promote waste reduction. These events helped demonstrate the affect an individual can have and allowed persons who participated to receive a reusable grocery bag and a composting bin to utilize. The District was also able to develop a website that allows the citizens of northwest Missouri to find answers to their recycling or waste disposal questions.

The lacking infrastructure in northwest Missouri resulted in the District providing grants to eligible subgrantees to provide banned item collections. The District funded grants for waste tire, household hazardous waste, and electronic waste collections. The district believed funding these grants was important to keep the waste out of local ditches and streams. The household hazardous waste and electronic waste collection turned out to be a much needed service to the region as the subgrantee reported higher than expected diversion for the event.

RECEIVED BY

SEP 28 2009

SWMP OPERATIONS

3 (b). What waste goals does the district have for the upcoming fiscal period and what actions does the district plan to take to achieve these goals. Please include the types of grant proposals that will be sought for the upcoming period to assist in meeting these goals.

In the upcoming fiscal year the District plans to continue to focus on educating the public to reduce the amount of waste entering the local waste stream; however, instead of adult based programs the district completed last year it is going to aim the message of reduce, reuse, recycle to students. The District has plans to implement an educational workshop for elementary students in hopes that early exposure to the importance of recycling will create public movement towards rebuilding a recycling infrastructure. The District has also approved grants for the new fiscal year that will collect banned items throughout the five county region along with projects that promote reuse and recycling. The funds provided to subgrantees will play a major role in the district's goal to reduce waste entering the local waste stream.

4 (a). What recycling goals did the district have for the fiscal year period and what actions did the district take to achieve these goals?

1. The District wanted to implement a district-wide education program to inform the region about the need to recycle and ways the public can help in recycling even in a region with lacking infrastructure for recycling. In order for the District to achieve the goal it created a website that provided the region's local recyclers and contact information. This allowed the public to become informed citizens where they can take certain recyclables and if they had any questions could contact the source directly. The website also included the area's retailers and the programs they implement such as O'Reilly Auto Parts and how it collects used oil and oil filters, and Wal-Mart accepting plastic bags to be recycled. The District found that its citizens were unaware of these services being provided by their retailers.

2. The District wanted to reduce as much electronic material from the waste stream as possible due to no infrastructure in the region for recycling electronics. The District was also concerned about the amount of televisions entering the landfill due to the digital conversion process because of the potential levels of lead from the cathode ray tubes of televisions. In order for the District to achieve the goal it looked toward its grant applicants and funded a banned item collection that encompassed the collection of electronics. Through funding the grant the subgrantee reported to the District that 18.54 tons of electronics were diverted which included many older televisions.

RECEIVED BY

SEP 28 2009

SWMP OPERATIONS

4 (b). What recycling goals does the district have for the upcoming fiscal year period and what actions does the district plan to take to achieve these goals? Please include the types of grant proposals that will be sought for the upcoming period to assist in meeting these goals.

The recycling goals during the new fiscal year are similar to last year's. The District still feels the region needs more education regarding recycling and reducing waste. The District however has decided to shift its goals toward educating student-aged children. The District is hopeful that by starting the education early the children will grow to be conscious adults about the benefits of reducing, recycling, and reusing. Through plan implementation the District is planning on holding an educational workshop that will provide students a fun learning experience about reducing, reusing, and recycling.

The District has also already funded a grant to provide another electronic collection within the region. The response the subgrantee received last year made the District realize the need to provide citizens electronic recycling again even after the digital conversion. The amount of computers, printers, cell phones, stereos, and other electronic devices that are making their way to the landfill is undeniably a problem the District would like to reduce.

5 (a). What resource recovery goals did the district have for the fiscal year period and what actions did the district take to achieve these goals?

The District was concerned about the amount of organic waste being thrown in the trash and the consequences of those actions. The District was aware of the potential of the organic waste and decided to sponsor a composting workshop to educate the public about its benefits. This goal was completed through plan implementation funds and not only allowed funding for a workshop, but also to purchase composting bins for the participants to utilize after the seminar. There were 42 individuals that attended the composting workshop and their response was very positive.

5 (b). What resource recovery goals does the district have for the upcoming fiscal year period and what actions does the district plan to take to achieve these goals? Please include the types of grant proposals that will be sought for the upcoming period to assist in meeting these goals.

The District is conscious about the potential for organic waste and paper waste. The region has seen the benefits of recovering paper and the amount of waste diverted and money saved through Northwest Missouri State University's pellet plant. The university's ability to convert paper products into a material that will heat and cool the university is very effective. The District will continue to work with area schools to utilize the university's pellet plant as a way to reuse paper products in a beneficial way for the environment and financially. The District would like to see more area schools consider using the university's capabilities instead of throwing their paper into the trash.

The District also funded a grant application for the new fiscal year that will recover wood waste from local businesses and mill the wood waste into a usable product that would be burned in wood pellet stoves or furnaces to heat commercial and residential structures. Through this project the District's goal is to reuse the amount of waste from area businesses that would otherwise enter the landfill. The subgrantee's intent is to add paper products to the wood waste further reducing reusable material from the waste stream. This would allow the region one more outlet for wood and paper products.

RECEIVED BY

SEP 28 2009

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

6. SUMMARIZE THE TYPES OF PROJECTS AND RESULTS DURING FISCAL YEAR (ADDITIONAL SHEETS MAY BE ATTACHED IF NEEDED.)

Name of Project Resulting in Tonnage Diversions from Landfills.	Cost of Project.	Number of Tons Diverted.	Average Cost Per Ton Diverted.
A2009-03 Collection A	\$2,730.30	22.07 tons	\$123.71/ton
A2009-04 Collection B	\$8,120.16	55.09 tons	\$147.40/ton
A2009-05 Collection C	\$35,639.81	34.99 tons	\$1,018.57/ton

Measurable outcomes achieved.

The three collections were all banned-item collections. Collection A and B were waste tire collections. Collection C was household hazardous waste and electronic waste collection. All three projects were conducted district-wide and benefited the most citizens than any other project funded. Collection C was an expensive collection; however, the region was in great need for proper collection and disposal of these materials. Otherwise the materials collected at this event would have resulted in illegal dumping and increased health and environment risks for the region.

See Attachment 1 for an additional project that resulted in diversion.

RECEIVED BY

SEP 28 2009

SWMP OPERATIONS

MO 780-1989 (06-08)

7. SUMMARIZE PROJECTS NOT RESULTING IN TONNAGE DIVERSION

Projects not resulting in tonnage diversions from landfills.	Cost of Project
A2009-02 Plan Implementation	\$25,356.23

Measurable outcomes achieved for these projects.

Plan Implementation encompassed many projects that did not have any recordable diversion, but all the projects would have indirectly affected diversion rates because these projects were educational in nature. The projects completed within Plan Implementation included attending fairs and passing out reusable grocery bags with educational information inside, holding a composting workshop which allowed each participant to take home their own composting bin, creation and maintenance of a recycling resource website, and update the solid waste plan. The four tasks allowed the District to reach out to many individuals and start them on a path of reducing, reusing, and recycling creating a increased diversion results.

8. IDENTIFY SEPARATE STATISTICS FOR ITEMS BANNED FROM LANDFILLS

List projects resulting in tonnage diversions from landfills.	List cost of project resulting in tonnage diversion.	Number of tons diverted from project.	Average cost per ton diverted.
A2009-03 Collection A	\$2,730.30	22.07 tons	\$123.71/ton
A2009-04 Collection B	\$8,120.16	55.09 tons	\$147.40/ton
A2009-05 Collection C	\$35,639.81	34.99 tons	\$1,018.57/ton

9. IDENTIFY SEPARATE STATISTICS FOR ITEMS NOT BANNED FROM LANDFILLS

List projects resulting in tonnage diversions from landfills.	List cost of project resulting in tonnage diversion.	Number of tons diverted from project.	Average cost per ton diverted.
A2009-07 Opportunity Workshop	\$7,756.70	36.4 tons	\$213.10/ton

10. Describe your district's grant proposal evaluation process.

The grant proposal evaluation process is completed by the Executive Board. Board members receive a copy of each application along with grant criteria point sheet to score the applicant, a targeted materials list, a grant evaluation score sheet to record points awarded to applicant, and a spreadsheet showing available funds that may be awarded. Once each board member is done reviewing the applications the results are tallied from the individual board member's score sheet. The applicants who receive the highest scores are approved for the grant. The board may choose to partially fund some projects. The number of projects approved depends on the level of funding available.

See Attachment 2 for grant criteria point sheet.

RECEIVED BY
SEP 28 2009
SWMP OPERATIONS

ATTACHMENT 1

6. SUMMARIZE THE TYPES OF PROJECTS AND RESULTS DURING FISCAL YEAR

Name of Project Resulting in Tonnage Diversions from Landfill	Cost of Project	Number of Tons Diverted	Average Cost Per Ton Diverted
A2009-07 Opportunity Workshop	\$7,756.70	36.4 tons	\$213.10/ton
Measurable outcomes achieved The funds allocated to the Opportunity Workshop helped purchase a forklift for the shelter. The initial purpose of the forklift was to help divert cardboard waste; however it ended up diverting plastic film as well. The forklift provided continued support for three jobs at the shelter, one supervisor and two shelter employees. The forklift will continue to divert waste beyond the grant period, so if you calculate the cost per ton diverted over the machine's lifetime it would be much lower.			

RECEIVED BY

SEP 28 2009

SWMP OPERATIONS

ATTACHMENT 2

Northwest Missouri Regional Solid Waste Management District

District Grant Evaluation Review Criteria

Technical Feasibility

Possible Points—45

Detail in which the proposal was created

25 points – detailed, complete with no additional data required to complete review of application

10 points – Substantially complete but additional data required to complete review of application

0 points – Not complete or insufficient data for consideration

Technical capability of the applicant and staff

5 points – Extensive experience (five years or more)

3 points – Limited experience

0 points – no experience

Compliance with federal, state or local requirements

10 points – Proposal demonstrates that all federal, state and local permits, approvals, licenses or waivers necessary to implement the project have been applied for (copies attached).

4 points – Proposal indicates awareness of permits but applications have not been submitted.

0 points – Applicant submitted no evidence of obtaining needed permits and no documentation that permits are needed.

Availability of feedstock

5 points – Sufficient supply of feedstock within the District

3 points – Sufficient supply of feedstock outside the District

0 points – Adequate supply of feedstock questionable

Managerial Capability

Possible Points—30

Managerial capability of the applicant and staff

5 points – Extensive experience (five years or more)

3 points – Limited experience

0 points – no experience

Knowledge of appropriate accounting procedures

5 points – Extensive experience (five years or more)

3 points – Limited experience

0 points – no experience

Budget quality

20 points – Well organized, thorough budget that includes explanatory notes on all expenditures

10 points – Budget is complete, but unorganized and missing information and/or budget notes

0 points – No budget included in the application

Applicability to District Plan and Targets

Possible Points—30

RECEIVED BY

SEP 28 2009

SWMP OPERATIONS

Conforms with State/District targeted materials list

10 points – The project reduces or recycles a targeted material in list A

5 points – The project reduces or recycles a targeted material in list B

3 points – The project or recycles a material not targeted

0 points – The project does not involve any specific material

Conforms with State resource recovery priorities

10 points – The project is for waste reduction

5 points – The project is for collection/processing, market development or composting

2 points – The project is for energy recovery

Applicability to District's Solid Waste Management Plan

10 points – All aspects of the project target the goals of the District Plan

6 points – The project will address waste reduction in ways not specifically mentioned in the District Plan

0 points – The project does not address the District Plan's goals

Financing

Possible Points—20

Level of commitment for financing

10 points – All financing for the project is committed and documented

3 points – Sufficient financing is likely, but not yet committed

0 points – Proposed financing is questionable

Type of match provided by the applicant

10 points – Match greater than 30%

7 points – Match 25-30%

5 points – Match 20-24%

0 points – Match less than 20%

RECEIVED BY

SEP 28 2009

SWMP OPERATIONS

Other Possible Points

Possible Points—80

Potential to create jobs

25 points – project employs an employee with a minimum commitment to continue the project two years beyond the grant funding

10 points – Project employs an employee with a one year commitment to continue the project beyond the grant funding

0 points – No commitment to continue the project beyond the grant funding

Potential market development within the District

30 points – Project produces a product using post-consumer resources located within the District

10 points – Project produces a product using post-consumer resources located outside the District

0 points – Product does not contain post-consumer resources

Ability to implement project in a timely manner

10 points – Project likely to be completed in a timely manner based on the time line

5 points – Implementing project in a timely manner is a concern

0 points – Project is not likely to be implemented in a timely manner

Transferability of results

5 points – Project can easily be replicated in other areas of the region or state

0 points – Project is site specific and cannot be replicated in other areas

Demonstration of cooperative efforts

10 points – Documentation of support and approval of the local governing body

0 points – No documentation of support from local governing body

RECEIVED BY

SEP 28 2009

SWMP OPERATIONS